

REMARKS

The specification is objected to as not having an appropriate arrangement, as indicated on page 2 of the present Office Action. Applicants amend the specification, as indicated herein, and believe that these changes obviate the Examiner's objections to the specification.

Also, the Examiner objects to claims 15 and 33 for the reasons set forth at the top of page 3 of the present Office Action. With respect to claims 15 and 33, Applicants amend these claims, as indicated herein, for clarification purposes, and believe that these amendments obviate the Examiner's claim objections.

Claims 1-41 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24, 28-33, 35-37, 39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kazmi (US Patent No. 6,044,261). Claims 2-6, 8, 10, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated over Kazmi.

§ 102(b) Rejections (Kazmi) - Claims 1, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24, 28-33, 35-37, 39,
and 41

The above listed claims are rejected over Kazmi for the reasons set forth on pages 3-6 of the present Office Action.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Kazmi does not teach or suggest at least, "detection of the geographical area (Cj) in which said mobile telephone device (UE-i) is located at predetermined times," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 3-45 of Kazmi as allegedly satisfying the above-quoted feature. However, the cited portion of Kazmi simply discusses the need for associating multiple home zones with a particular mobile

subscriber. Nowhere does Kazmi describe that a geographical area in which a mobile telephone device is located, is detected at predetermined times.

Further, with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Kazmi does not disclose at least, “analysis of said sets of location parameters stored at chosen intervals,” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 9-31, of Kazmi as allegedly satisfying the quoted feature set forth in this paragraph. However, Kazmi only describes, in part, that when a mobile station 40 associated with a subscriber travels into a coverage area being served by a particular mobile switching center (MSC) 10, the serving MSC performs a location update with the associated home location register (HLR) 70 to inform the HLR of the mobile station’s new locations and the identity of the serving MSC. There is no mention in Kazmi of analyzing sets of location parameters that are stored at chosen intervals. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Kazmi does anticipate the invention as set forth in claim 1. Applicant submits that independent claim 24 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits dependent claim 7, 9, 11-15, 17-19, 21-22, 28-33, 35-37, 39, and 41 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 24.

Further, with respect to dependent claims 18 and 36, these claims specifically recite that said field is selected from the group including at least “Home”, “Office” and “Other” fields. Nowhere does Kazmi disclose a group including the above-quoted fields. Therefore, Kazmi does not anticipate claims 18 and 36.

Further, with respect to claims 7 and 28, the Examiner cites col. 6, lines 9-31 of Kazmi as satisfying the features of these claims. However, as described above, Kazmi only describes, in part, that when a mobile station 40 associated with a subscriber travels into a coverage area being served by a particular mobile switching center (MSC) 10, the serving MSC performs a location update with the associated home location register (HLR) 70 to inform the HLR of the mobile station's new locations and the identity of the serving MSC. Nowhere does Kazmi disclose that the geographical area is stored in corresponding relationship to its time of detection.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Kazmi) - Claims 2-6, 8, 10, and 25-27

Claims 2-6, 8, 10, and 25-27 are rejected based on the reasons set forth on pages 7-8 of the present Office Action.

First, Applicant submits that claims 2-6, 8, 10, and 25-27 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 24.

Further, with respect to claims 2 and 25, the Examiner alleges that it is obvious to one skilled in the art that the detection is periodic since the user has setup the schedule for the home zone. However, Applicant submits that the user setting up a schedule for a home zone in no way satisfies the feature that the detection of geographical area in which a mobile telephone device is located is performed periodically, or at regular occurring intervals. Therefore, Applicant submits that the features of claims 2 and 25 are not disclosed by Kazmi.

Further, with respect to claim 8, this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claims 7 and 28.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Kazmi/Hussain) - Claims 16, 20, 23, 34, 38 and 40

Claim 16, 20, 23, 43, 38 and 40 are rejected based on the reasons set forth on pages 8-10 of the present Office Action.

First, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 24.

With respect to each of claims 20, 23, 38, and 40, the Examiner cites similar sections of Kazmi as allegedly satisfying the specific features set forth in these respective claims. However, upon review of the cited portions of Kazmi and Hussain, the specific features set forth in these claims are not disclosed.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 12, 2005